

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	T I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,144		12/12/2003	Michael J. Shebek	APC-P0002	1570
27268	7590	07/03/2006		EXAMINER	
BAKER &			FETSUGA, ROBERT M		
300 NORTH SUITE 2700		IAN STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
INDIANAPO	DLIS, IN	46204	3751		
				DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/735,144	SHEBEK, MICHAEL J.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Robert M. Fetsuga	3751				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DISSIDERS OF THE MAILING DEPOSITE OF THE MAILING DEPO	OATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 M	<u>May 2006</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18 and 19 is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	hdrawn from consideration.					
	on Papers	or decitor requirement.					
	The specification is objected to by the Examin	or					
• —	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac		Examiner.				
. 4/	Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachmen		-					
	be of References Cited (PTO-892) be of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) 🔲 Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 or No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/735,144

Art Unit: 3751

1. Claims 1 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a track and coping assembly with a insert plate, does not reasonably provide enablement for a track and coping assembly without a insert plate. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Page 2

Applicant argues at pages 1-2 of the response filed May 18, 2006 the examiner did not properly consider the declaration of Bruce Holmes. To the contrary, the declaration was fully considered, and its probative value weighed accordingly. Note the Office mailed February 14, 2006 at paragraph 2.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

⁽e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 3751

3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a/e) as being anticipated by Last '990.

Page 3

The Last '990 reference discloses a track and coping assembly comprising: a coping 26 including a slot having an opening 42, an inner wall 31, an opposite inner wall 33, and a tab 32; a reversible track 11 including a first channel 16 having a first opening 17, a second channel 19 having a second opening 21, and two locking ledges 13; an insert wedge 34; a pulley 23; and a pulley housing 36, as claimed. Re claims 1 and 12, the openings 17,21 in Last are "adapted to receive" different rope/slider arrangements as discussed at column 5, lines 33-42, therein. Furthermore, these statements of intended use does not appear to impose any patentably distinguishing structure of the claimed assembly over that disclosed by Last.

Applicant argues at page 2 of the response the examiner should give probative value to the declaration of Bruce Holmes. The examiner agrees, and notes the declaration was fully considered, and its probative value weighed accordingly. Note the Office mailed February 14, 2006 at paragraph 5. Applicant argues at pages 2-3 of the response the "claims" require channels having different configurations. The examiner can not agree as the presence of such a limitation has neither been

Art Unit: 3751

found in the "claims" by the examiner, nor pointed out by applicant.

- 4. Applicant is referred to MPEP 714.02 and 608.01(o) in responding to this Office action.
- 5. The grounds of rejection have been reconsidered in light of applicant's arguments, but are still deemed to be proper.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/735,144 Page 5

Art Unit: 3751

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert M. Fetsuga at telephone number 571/272-4886 who can be most easily reached Monday through Thursday. The Office central fax number is 571/273-8300.

Robert M. Fetsuga Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751